DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 538 IR 052 195

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Baker, Sharon L. |
| TITLE | Exploring the Use of "Output Measures for Public Libraries" in North Carolina Public Libraries. |
| SPONS AGENCY | North Carolina Library Association. |
| PUB DATE | Aug 87 |
| NOTE | 23p. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Research/Technical (143) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Adoption (Ideas); *Evaluation Criteria; *Library Administration; *Library Planning; Library Services; *Library Standards; Library Surveys; Long Range Planning; Operations Research; *Public Libraries; Research Methodology; Use Studies |
| IDENTIFIERS | Library Directors; *North Carolina; *Output Measures for Public Libraries |

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to determine: (1) whether the 5-year planning cycle described in the 1980 manual "A Planning Process for Public Libraries" is being used in North Carolina's public libraries; (2) whether output measures described in a second publication released in 1982 are being collected in the state's public libraries; (3) the levels of performance that are being achieved on the various output measures; and (4) whether variations in selected measures are associated with other underlying factors. The supposition that larger libraries should be adopting such innovations in planning and accountability as the methods described in "A Planning Process for Public Libraries" and "Output Measures for Public Libraries" at a faster rate than smaller libraries is also examined. Based on an analysis of the responses of 61 North Carolina libraries to a questionnaire distributed to the 106 library directors in the state, study results indicate that a quarter of the directors were using the recommended 5-year planning cycle, fewer than half of the directors were using at least some of the output measures, and no library collected data on all of the measures. It was tentatively concluded that North Carolina libraries appear to be following a national pattern of non-use of the two manuals, and it is recommended that steps be taken so that public libraries in North Carolina will recognize the importance of planning and evaluation. Study results are presented in nine tables, and nine footnotes are provided. (KM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED288538

# EXPLORING THE USE OF OUTPUT MEASURES FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN NORTH CAROLINA PUBLIC LIBRARIES**

by Dr. Sharon L. Baker
University of Iowa
School of Library and Information Science
3072 Library
Iowa City, IA 52242

**This research received funding from the Research Grant Program of the Public Library Section of the North Carolina Library Association.

IR052195

© Sharon L. Baker
August, 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sharon L. Baker
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## INTRODUCTION

Since 1980, two publications have served as the base for the Public Library Association's attempt to improve the quality of public library service nationwide. The first, A Planning Process for Public Libraries[1], was a five-year planning cycle. This cycle required that each library analyze its individual community, determine its role be within that community, develop goals and objectives and strategies to achieve that role, and evaluate the library's success in implementing change.

The second publication, Output Measures for Public Libraries, was released in 1982 to provide libraries with standardized procedures to evaluate their achievement through twelve simple output (use) measures.[2]

These documents, when used together in an intelligent and comprehensive manner, should enable libraries to set their own performance-based standards, and thus to work to improve their own facilities, resources and services. The documents were actually an attempt by PLA to wean libraries away from quantitative national standards. Such standards were originally designed to help speed library development by setting minimally acceptable levels of service which libraries could use to gauge the adequacy of their existing services and resources. However, in recent years, the national standards have been criticized for lacking an empirical base, focussing on quantity rather than quality, overemphasizing resources (inputs), failing to take into account variations in library size and funding patterns, and the like.[3]

Currently, some public librarians are still not completely satisfied with the publications which replaced the traditional quantitative standards. Major complaints include the fact that these documents were found to be time consuming to use, do not allow libraries to compare their performance to libraries of similar size with similar resources, and do not specify minimum levels of resources needed to provide quality service (measures which public libraries used extensively in the past to help justify funding increases).

To combat these complaints, PLA is currently issuing revised versions of the documents, and will launch a national program of data collection on public library measures of input and output. Input measures are rather easy to gather and are currently being collected by various state library agencies, including North Carolina's Department of Cultural Resources. However, collection of comparable data on output measures will not become a reality for three to five years.[4] A number of states, including North Carolina, are also continuing to develop and promote statewide standards which specify minimum levels of resources needed to provide quality library service.

At this point, the effects of both A Planning Process for Public Libraries and Output Measures for Public Libraries are thought to be widespread. For example, McClure et al. recently suggested that the 1982 publication of Output Measures for Public Libraries had "increased the professional community's awareness of the importance of and need for measurement of library services; provided specific means and procedures for computing those measures; provided a tool by which public librarians can

quantitatively demonstrate the degree to which various objectives are accomplished; (and) shown that measurement of public library services ... could be done in a wide range of public libraries."[5] And in fact one could argue that those libraries which are using both A Planning Process and Output Measures have profited from a better understanding of the library's place within the community, as well as realization of its current levels of performance in specific areas (e.g., title fill rate).

In actuality, however, the effects of the two documents appear to have been limited for at least three reasons. First, there is little evidence that widespread adoption of either document has occurred. In fact, informal conversations with directors in North Carolina in 1986 indicated that the opposite was true. Thus, it is necessary to see if this impression is a valid one, and if so, to find out why in order to determine if this situation can be corrected. This is particularly crucial in view of the fact that the committees currently working on updating the 1976 North Carolina public library standards are emphasizing planning and will be asking that libraries begin calculating selected measures of output.

Second, only one national report shows output measure data which was collected by a range of libraries.[6] Such information is needed primarily for comparison purposes. Many librarians would benefit from knowing, for example, that other libraries of their size had achieved a browsing fill rate of 70%, while they had only achieved a rate of 45%. This would indicate a real need to explore underlying reasons for their low performance.

Third, while the output measures provide a library with a broad indication of its own performance, underlying reasons for the variations in performance have not been fully explored. For example, the Baltimore County Public Library in Maryland discovered that the subject fill rate varied from 61% at one branch to 86% at another branch, even though a central book selection office had built similar collections at both branches.

This study, therefore, was designed to determine:

1. whether the planning process is being used in North Carolina's public libraries (and if not, why not);

2. whether output measures are being collected in North Carolina's public libraries (and if not, why not);

3. what levels of performance are being achieved on the various output measures; and

4. if variations in selected measures are associated with other underlying factors (e.g., the educational level of the community served).

One further piece of background needs to be provided before beginning: a brief discussion of the concept of innovation. Both A Planning Process and Output Measures are new innovations within the library field. That is, they are new techniques designed to accomplish an old task in a better way. Recently, Damanpour and Childers described the adoption of innovations in public libraries and concluded that currently libraries are increasingly adopting more innovations to improve their performance.[7] In particular, three types of innovations were on the rise: innovations in technical services, in certain minority services (e.g., services to the handicapped), and in planning and accountability. Within this latter category are included such innovations as formalized procedures for strategic planning,

operational planning, objective-setting, and evaluation. One other finding is relevant here: Damanpour and Childers found that one major factor which had a significant effect on the rate of innovation was library size.

The findings of these authors suggest that A Planning Process and Output Measures, both innovations in planning and accountability, should be ripe for use by libraries in North Carolina. Furthermore, they suggest that larger libraries should be adopting these processes at a faster rate than the smaller ones. This study will also examine this supposition.

## METHODOLOGY

In November of 1986, a literature review was conducted to provide background information for the study. A questionnaire was then developed to address the concerns mentioned above. The questionnaire was pretested with directors at five public libraries. After a slight revision, the questionnaire was printed and distributed to all 106 library directors in the state in March, 1987. A follow-up questionnaire was sent out six weeks later to increase the response rate.

North Carolina is a state with varying levels of library service, ranging from extensive regional and county systems to tiny municipal libraries run by nonprofessionals and open only a few hours per week. 61 of the 106 questionnaires were completed, yielding an acceptable response rate of 58%. The bulk of the nonresponses came from the tiny libraries with no professional staff.

Questionnaire responses were summarized and doublechecked for accuracy at two different points. Two additional pieces of information were also added to the questionnaires: the size of the library's professional staff and the size of the population served. Both these measures were added to give an indication of the library's size for use in the analysis. Size measures were taken from the December 1986 issue of Statistics and Directory of North Carolina Public Libraries, which publishes library data from the 1986 fiscal year.[8]

For the most part, questionnaire results were analyzed using the statistical measure chi-square. Results were considered to be statistically significant only when the probability of the results occurring by chance was less than five times out of one hundred ($p < .05$).

The questionnaire was designed to address the first three of the concerns raised above: whether A Planning Process and Output Measures were being used, and what scores were obtained on the latter. A follow-up case study approach was planned to address the fourth concern: are variations in selected output measures associated with other underlying factors (e.g., the educational level of the community)?

To accomplish this, an in-depth analysis was planned of the data from three libraries in regard to three specific output measures. While variation in all could be explored, limitations of time and money prevented this. The three output measures selected for more detailed study were browsing fill rate, title fill rate, and subject fill rate, as these relate directly to one of the library's main functions -- provision of materials for

patron use.

The three libraries chosen for further study were to be selected after an intensive review of the data to determine which libraries were performing on a level significantly higher or lower than their counterparts, for it is these libraries which can provide the most insight in this matter. The researcher planned to visit these libraries for two days to gather data on a pre-selected list of possible factors causing the variation, and to interview directors and branch librarians as to their perceptions of the issue.

## STUDY RESULTS

### The Use of A PLANNING PROCESS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

PLA has spend the greater part of the past seven years in making public libraries aware of the five-year planning cycle detailed in A Planning Process for Public Libraries. And to a large extent they have been successful in familiarizing libraries with its purpose and its specifics. As Tables 1 and 2 show, 71% of all the libraries were familiar with the process. In fact, as expected, familiarity was significantly related to both measures of library size. That is, the larger the library in terms of population served and professional staff employed, the more likely the library director was to be familiar with the process.

Fourteen of the eighteen directors who said they were unfamiliar with A Planning Process did not have a master's degree in library science. Few of these directors were active members of

TABLE 1.

FAMILIARITY WITH AND USE OF
A PLANNING PROCESS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES
CROSSANALYZED BY SIZE OF POPULATION SERVED

| | POPULATION SERVED | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CATEGORY | 0-10,000 NO. (%) | 10,001-35,000 NO. (%) | 35,001-70,000 NO. (&) | 70,001 OR MORE NO. (%) | TOTAL NO. (%) |
| Familiar with | 3 (20) | 6 (50) | 15 (100) | 20 (100) | 44 (71) |
| Not familiar with | 12 (80) | 6 (50) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 18 (29) |
| Using | 0 (0) | 3 (25) | 4 (27) | 8 (40) | 15 (24) |
| Not using | 15(100) | 9 (75) | 11 (73) | 12 (60) | 47 (76) |

TABLE 2.

FAMILIARITY WITH AND USE OF
A PLANNING PROCESS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES,
CROSSANALYZED BY NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF

| | NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CATEGORY | 0 NO. (%) | 0.1-5.0 NO. (%) | 5.1 OR MORE NO. (%) | TOTAL NO. (%) |
| Familiar with | 1 (7) | 31 (89) | 12 (100) | 44 (71) |
| Not familiar with | 14 (93) | 4 (11) | 0 (0) | 18 (29) |
| Using | 0 (0) | 9 (26) | 6 (50) | 15 (24) |
| Not using | 15 (100) | 26 (74) | 6 (50) | 47 (76) |

either the state or national organizations so their lack of knowledge is not surprising.

The four professional directors who lacked the same knowledge had obtained their library degrees between eight and thirty-five years ago, before A Planning Process was published. Only one of these directors was a member of PLA or regularly read Public Libraries. However, all were members of the North Carolina Library Association, had attended a recent statewide conference, and said they regularly read North Carolina Libraries. Their lack of knowledge should certainly be of concern to officials of North Carolina's state library, to NCLA, and to PLA, for it implies that seven years after a major publication was introduced, some professionals were still unaware of it.

While almost three-quarters of the library directors were familiar with A Planning Process, only one quarter were actually using the process in their libraries. Again, larger libraries were significantly more likely to be using the process.

PLA initially dropped national quantitative standards, reasoning that most public libraries would adopt this method of creating community-based standards to improve library service. If, however, a majority of libraries are not using A Planning Process, and this is certainly the case here, at least two questions arise. First, why aren't the libraries using the process? Second, are the libraries using Output Measures to evaluate their services if they are not using A Planning Process?

In regard to the first question, forty-seven library directors listed the reasons why they were not using A Planning Process. Results are shown in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3.

REASONS WHY LIBRARIES ARE NOT USING A PLANNING PROCESS*

| REASON | NO. | (%) |
|---|---|---|
| The process itself takes too much time | 10 | (21) |
| We don't have enough staff to do this | 8 | (17) |
| Long-term planning is not worth the time and effort it takes to do it | 7 | (15) |
| My time is too limited to organize this | 6 | (13) |
| Our staff doesn't have the expertise to do this | 6 | (13) |
| We don't need a formal planning process | 6 | (13) |
| The process is too complicated for our needs | 6 | (13) |
| We're too busy coping with important things to worry about this | 4 | ( 9) |
| We current use a different planning process | 4 | ( 9) |
| We're waiting for the revised manual to come out | 3 | ( 6) |
| We just haven't gotten around to doing this yet | 3 | ( 6) |

*Libraries could list more than one reason for not using this process.

Some library directors are reflecting here the general recognition that the planning process, as it was spelled out in 1980, was complex and difficult, and required a rather extensive commitment in staff time over a period of several years (a fact which the new manual, A Planning and Roles Setting Manual for Public Libraries, issued in July 1987, is designed to correct). A few other directors are following different plans which they feel are more suited to their library's size and circumstances.

However, it is a negative sign that a number of directors feel that long-term planning is not worthwhile, that planning in

general is not needed, or that planning is unimportant when compared with everyday coping activities. These findings are actually quite similar to those reported by Moore in 1981.[9] Moore surveyed a sample of public, special and academic library directors in Missouri and discovered that only 37% did any type of long-term planning. Moreover, few directors reported the use of any formal planning techniques, saying that most plans were prepared informally by the directors and their staffs. A majority listed lack of budget and/or staff resources as their reason for not engaging in long-term planning.

Moore's findings, and those of this study, suggest that the profession is not doing as good a job as it might be in convincing library directors of the importance of planning in enabling a library to respond rationally to change, establish funding priorities, determine individual and departmental accountability, and the like. In fact, one could argue that these directors might have more staff if they devoted more time to planning to upgrade their resources.

The Use of OUTPUT MEASURES FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Directors were also asked about their use of Output Measures for Public Libraries. As Tables 4 and 5 show, this tool was slightly more popular than A Planning Process; however, fewer than half the libraries were using some of the measures and no library was using all of them. (The average number of measures used was 5.) Again, the larger libraries (those which served a larger population and those with more professional staff) were using the measures significantly more than smaller libraries.

TABLE 4.

NO. OF LIBRARIES COLLECTING OUTPUT MEASURES IN 1986,
CROSSANALYZED BY SIZE OF POPULATION SERVED

| | POPULATION SERVED | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CATEGORY | 0-10,000 NO. (%) | 10,001-35,000 NO. (%) | 35,001-70,000 NO. (%) | 70,001 OR MORE NO. (%) | TOTAL NO. (%) |
| No measures used | 13 (87) | 8 (67) | 8 (53) | 7 (35) | 36 (58) |
| Some measures used | 2 (13) | 4 (33) | 7 (47) | 13 (65) | 26 (42) |

TABLE 5.

NO. OF LIBRARIES COLLECTING OUTPUT MEASURES IN 1986,
CROSSANALYZED BY NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF

| | NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CATEGORY | 0 NO. (%) | 0.1-5.0 NO. (%) | 5.1 OR MORE NO. (%) | TOTAL NO. (%) |
| No measures used | 15 (100) | 18 (51) | 3 (25) | 36 (58) |
| Some measures used | 0 (0) | 17 (49) | 9 (75) | 26 (42) |

Table 6 below lists the reasons why some directors said they were not using the output measures manual at all. The percentage figures given are based only on the responses of the thirty-four directors who weren't collecting any output measures.

TABLE 6.

REASONS WHY SOME DIRECTORS WILL NOT COLLECT ANY OUTPUT MEASURES

| REASON | NO. | (%) |
|---|---|---|
| My staff doesn't have the time to collect the data | 20 | (59) |
| These measures are irrelevant for my library's needs | 5 | (15) |
| I am unfamiliar with Output Measures for Public Libraries | 4 | (12) |
| My staff doesn't have the expertise to collect or analyze the data | 3 | ( 9) |
| I won't collect the data unless the state library requires it in their report | 2 | ( 6) |

Again the major reason for nonuse was the lack of staff time, although some directors said that they did not find the process relevant for the needs of their libraries.

The other 26 directors were using some but not all of the measures. Table 7 below shows which output measures were used the most. One interesting pattern which appears is that the most popular output measures -- circulation per capita, reference transactions per capita, program attendance per capita, library visits per capita, registration as a percentage of population, and turnover rate -- are all quite easily computed based upon statistics that all libraries in North Carolina are required to report to the Division of State Library. At least two observations arise from this. First, it would be easy for ALL

libraries in the state to compute these measures within a matter of minutes. Second, few output measures are being used which require additional data collection. Both of these observations again imply that the profession has not yet convinced these library directors that these evaluation measures are worth the time and effort they take to calculate.

TABLE 7.

TOTAL NUMBER OF LIBRARIES COLLECTING EACH OUTPUT MEASURE

| MEASURE | NO. | (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Circulation per capita | 23 | (37) |
| In-library materials use per capita | 9 | (15) |
| Library visits per capita | 18 | (29) |
| Program attendance per capita | 20 | (32) |
| Reference transactions per capita | 22 | (35) |
| Reference fill rate | 3 | ( 5) |
| Title fill rate | 3 | ( 5) |
| Subject and author fill rate | 3 | ( 5) |
| Browsers' fill rate | 3 | ( 5) |
| Registration as a percentage of population | 19 | (31) |
| Turnover rate | 15 | (24) |
| Document delivery | 3 | ( 5) |

This observation was confirmed by asking directors why they weren't collecting specific measures. As is shown in Table 8, the main reason library directors gave for not using a certain measure was lack of staff time to collect the data. Directors were particularly unwilling to expend staff time to collect reference fill rate, title fill rate, subject and author fill rate, browsers fill rate, and document delivery rate. Each of these measures requires use of a separate survey and a reasonable amount of staff time to collect and analyze. In-library materials

TABLE 8.

REASONS WHY PARTICULAR OUTPUT MEASURES WERE NOT COLLECTED

| MEASURE | REASON FOR NOT USING MEASURE: LACK OF STAFF TIME TO COLLECT DATA NO. (%) | MEASURE IS IRRELEVANT TO MY LIBRARY NO. (%) | NOT A VALID MEASURE OF EFFECTIVENESS NO. (%) | LACK OF STAFF EXPERTISE NO. (%) | COLLECTION METHOD INVALID NO. (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Circulation per capita | 0 (0) | 2 (8) | 2 (8) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| In-library materials use per capita | 10 (38) | 2 (8) | 2 (8) | 1 (4) | 1 (4) |
| Library visits per capita | 4 (15) | 1 (4) | 3 (12) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Program attendance per capita | 3 (12) | 2 (8) | 2 (8) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Reference transactions per capita | 2 (8) | 1 (4) | 2 (8) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Reference fill rate | 17 (65) | 3 (12) | 1 (4) | 2 (8) | 2 (8) |
| Title fill rate | 17 (65) | 2 (8) | 1 (4) | 2 (8) | 1 (4) |
| Subject and author fill rate | 17 (65) | 2 (8) | 1 (4) | 2 (8) | 1 (4) |
| Browser's fill rate | 17 (65) | 3 (12) | 1 (4) | 2 (8) | 2 (8) |
| Registration as a percentage of population | 2 (8) | 1 (4) | 1 (4) | 0 (0) | 1 (4) |
| Turnover rate | 5 (19) | 2 (8) | 3 (12) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Document delivery | 13 (50) | 4 (15) | 1 (4) | 2 (8) | 1 (4) |

use, which requires that a special count be made of materials which are left on tables for reshelving, was also collected infrequently.

A few directors also felt that certain measures were irrelevant to their library's needs, were invalid measures of library effectiveness, or used an invalid data collection method. A few more noted that their staff did not have the expertise to collect or analyze a particular measure.

What Output Measure Scores Were Obtained

This study was also designed to determine what scores libraries obtained on each output measure. However, so few libraries collected the measures that the scores reported here cannot be considered representative of those which could be obtained in the state if every library was using the measures. The scores are reported in table 9, but only for the reader's information. They represent the average, low and high scores for each of the twelve measures.

TABLE 9.

SCORES OBTAINED ON OUTPUT MEASURES

| MEASURE | NO. OF LIBRARIES REPORTING | AVERAGE | LOW | HIGH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Circulation per capita | 16 | 4.8 | 2.3 | 13.1 |
| In-library materials use per capita | 6 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 1.9 |
| Library visits per capita | 11 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 4.0 |
| Program attendance per capita | 14 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| Reference transactions per capita | 15 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 2.3 |
| Reference fill rate | 4 | 81.5% | 74.1% | 90.0% |
| Title fill rate | 3 | 60.7% | 38.2% | 76.4% |
| Subject and author fill rate | 3 | 79.1% | 68.5% | 88.7% |
| Browsers' fill rate | 2 | 90.2% | 88.8% | 91.6% |
| Registration as a percentage of population | 12 | 35.6% | 22.5% | 78.0% |
| Turnover rate | 11 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 12.0 |
| Document delivery | 1 | 24.9% | 24.9% | 24.9% |

Variations in Output Measures' Scores

A fourth goal of the study was to have been the in-depth analysis of variations in three measures: browsing fill rate, title fill rate, and subject fill rate. Due to the tiny number of libraries which collected data on these measures, this aspect of the study was dropped.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Results of the study show that use of A Planning Process and Output Measures are not as widespread as we might have hoped. Only a quarter of the directors were using the five-year planning cycle, and fewer than half were using at least some of the output measures. No library collected data on all of the measures.

At this point it behoves us to speculate about whether North Carolina as a state lags behind other states in implementing these two tools. No other statewide studies have been conducted of the use of these tools; however, Owen's study of the degree to which Output Measures is being promoted by the state libraries is related.

Owen found that only seven of the fifty states were promoting the measures through multiple library development activities. For example, Maryland requests that public libraries report output measures data, promotes the use of planning and evaluation by public libraries, and funds a variety of studies related to performance. Illinois has taken a different tack by integrating the output measures into its statewide quantitative standards, and requiring that libraries

show progress toward meeting the standards in order to qualify for state-aid grants.

Seven other states are using output measures in a single library development activity such as designing public library standards, ten are collecting output measures data at the state level, and five more are sponsoring continuing education events or providing consulting assistance. However, Owen found that twenty-one states, including North Carolina, are not currently using output measures as part of the library development program.

North Carolina appears to be typical in terms of its promotion of Output Measures. That is, the bulk of the state libraries are not following through with national developments by encouraging use of this document. No similar study has been done of the use of A Planning Process, but there is no reason to believe that the pattern of promotion for this is significantly different (and in fact it has not been in North Carolina).

Thus a tentative conclusion is that North Carolina libraries appear to be following a national pattern of non-use of these two documents. That is, librarians in North Carolina have not been convinced of the benefits in following a formal five-year cycle of planning, nor of the benefits in using output measures. It is true that the bulk of the respondents are not using these because of a lack of staff resources to carry out the processes; however, one could argue that libraries which lack these resources are the ones which most urgently need to be following formal processes for planning -- to enable them to get more resources and use the resources which they have more efficiently and effectively.

Two groups in North Carolina are currently working to change the status quo: the North Carolina Public Library Directors Association and the Public Libraries Section of the North Carolina Library Association. A joint committee of representatives from these groups has developed a first draft of new quantitative standards for public libraries. These standards emphasize that libraries should follow a planning cycle, focus on a major role or roles, establish goals and objectives, develop activities to meet these objectives, and evaluate their performance on a regular basis. Moreover, the standards incorporate most of the output measures.

The development of these new standards is an important first step in getting public libraries in North Carolina to recognize the importance of planning and evaluation. However, other steps also need to be taken. These include:

1. early adoption of the new proposed standards;

2. the development of a series of continuing education programs on the two new PLA-supported documents which replace the ones we have been discussing (A Planning and Roles Setting Manual for Public Libraries and Output Measures for Public Libraries, 2nd ed.);

3. consideration of a formula tying performance on certain standards into provisions for state aid;

4. revision of the state's statistical report to include measures of library output;

5. provision of consulting assistance to libraries which need additional help in collecting data; and

6. promotion and funding of additional studies of library performance.

Many of these ideas are currently being discussed. However, a concerted plan of attack needs to be made and responsibility

(both funding and administrative) for the activities need to be distributed among the three major forces in the state: the director's association, the public libraries section of the state association, and the state library. In order to be most effective, substantial funds to implement the program should be obtained -- either from the association coffers or from state or LSCA funds not already allocated to these activities. Additional help and consultation may also be sought from representatives of the state's three ALA-accredited library schools.

Without a concerted, coordinated program of effort to help libraries in the state realize the importance of planning and evaluation, PLA's national efforts to help upgrade public library services is doomed to failure at the state level.

FOOTNOTES

1 Vernon E. Palmour, Marcia C. Bellassai, and Nancy V. De Wath, A Planning Process for Public Libraries (Chicago: American Library Association, 1980).

2 Douglas Zweizig and Eleanor Jo Rodger, Output Measures for Public Libraries (Chicago: American Library Association, 1982).

3 Two articles which discuss some of these criticisms are: Morris Hamburg, Leonard E. Ramist, and Michael R. W. Bommer, "Library Objectives and Performance Measures and Their Use in Decision Making," Library Quarterly 42 (January 1972): 107-128; and Robert H. Rohlf, "Standards for Public Libraries," Library Trends 31 (Summer 1982): 65-76.

4 The three to five year data for data collection was provided by Mary Jo Lynch in ALA's Office of Research, during a July, 1986 conversation.

5 Charles R. McClure, Douglas L. Zweizig, Nancy A. Van House, and Mary Jo Lynch, "Output Measures: Myths, Realities, and Prospects," Public Libraries (Summer 1986): 49.

6 Douglas L. Zweizig, "Any Number Can Play: The First National Report of Output Measures Data," Public Libraries 24 (Summer 1985): 50-53.

7 Fariborz Damanpour and Thomas Childers, "The Adoption of Innovations in Public Libraries," Library and Information Science Research 7 (July-September 1985): 231-246.

8 Statistics and Directory of North Carolina Public Libraries: July 1, 1985 - June 30, 1986 (Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, 1986).

9 Gary Moore, "Library Long-Range Planning: A Survey of Current Practices," Library Research 3 (Summer 1981): 155-165.